

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

KIMBERLY COUCH,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:24-CV-767-MHT-KFP
)	
MAYOR STEVEN REED, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This Court previously ordered Plaintiff to file an Amended Complaint by January 31, 2025, and cautioned that failure to comply may result in dismissal of the case. Doc. 12. After Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint by this deadline, the Court entered an order requiring Plaintiff to show cause why she had not complied with the Court's Order and required her to file her amended complaint by March 4, 2025. Doc. 14. In this order, Plaintiff was warned once more that a failure to comply with the Court's Order would result in a recommendation of dismissal. Doc. 14. To date, Plaintiff has failed to comply and file an amended complaint.

As a result, the undersigned concludes this case should be dismissed without prejudice. *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (stating that dismissal for failure to obey a court order is generally not an abuse of discretion where litigant has been forewarned). The authority of courts to impose sanctions for failure to prosecute or obey an order is longstanding and acknowledged by Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629–30 (1962). This authority

empowers the courts “to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.” *Id.* at 630–31; *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-Op of Fla.*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989) (holding that “[t]he district court possesses the inherent power to police its docket.”). “The sanctions imposed [upon dilatory litigants] can range from a simple reprimand to an order dismissing the action with or without prejudice.” *Mingo*, 864 F.2d at 102.

Accordingly, the undersigned Magistrate Judge RECOMMENDS that this case be DISMISSED without prejudice.

Further, it is ORDERED that by **March 25, 2025**, the parties may file objections to this Recommendation. The parties must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Recommendation to which objection is made. Frivolous, conclusive, or general objections will not be considered by the Court. The parties are advised that this Recommendation is not a final order and, therefore, is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) will bar a party from a de novo determination by the District Court of legal and factual issues covered in the Recommendation and waive the right of the party to challenge on appeal the District Court’s order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by the District Court except on grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *See* 11th Cir. R. 3-1.

DONE this 11th day of March, 2025.

/s/ Kelly Fitzgerald Pate

KELLY FITZGERALD PATE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE